UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,006	10/25/2001	Bruce H. Morimoto	5412/1E887US2	4547

7590 10/01/2004

Darby & Darby
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022-7513

EXAMINER	
KISHORE, GOLLAMUDI S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/890,006	MORIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 22-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment dated 6-25-04 is acknowledged.

Claims included in the prosecution are 1-20 and 22-24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds wherein phosphocholine is directly linked to steroids, does not reasonably provide enablement for attachment through multitudes claimed linkers and multitudes of moieties defined in X. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d, 1400 (Fed.Cir.1988). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; 2) the state of the prior art; 3) the relative skill of those in the art; 4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; 5) the breadth of the claims; 6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; 7) the presence or absence of working examples; and 8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

1) The nature of the invention: the invention concerns with compounds wherein a phosphocholine is attached to a therapeutic compound through various linker units.

2) The state of the prior art: the state of the prior art is very high in terms of attaching therapeutic drugs to phospholipids; however, it is unclear however, whether one could prepare compounds through multitudes of linkers and X moieties as recited only in claims 1-9.

3) The relative skill of those in the art: the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art is very high (Ph.D level technology). It should be pointed out preparation of compounds, if they can be prepared takes years of bench work.

4) The predictability or unpredictability in the art: it is unclear whether multitudes of compounds can be prepared at all and if they can be prepared whether they would retain the drug efficacy since it depends on the efficient release from various linker units.

5). The breadth of the claims. The breadth of the claims is very broad in terms of the linker units and the X moieties

6) The amount of direction of guidance provided: instant specification provides no guidance at all in terms of how various linkers and X moieties are attached to various drugs claimed. In fact, the specification does not even recite these linkers and X moieties and the drugs claimed.

7) The presence or absence of working examples: the only working example provided is the attachment of specific steroid with phosphocholine by direct linkage and not through linkers and X moiety.

8) The quantity of experimentation necessary: since instant specification does not provide adequate guidance, it is difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art to choose the

proper linker and X moiety and the drug without undue experimentation. Broad claims must have broad basis of support in the specification; in the absence of such support, claims must be limited to drugs attached directly to the phosphocholine.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant directs the examiner's attention to pages 4-10 and argues that on these pages the nature of attachment and the nature of the linkers is clearly set forth. Applicant argues points out the pages 10 and 11 and argues at these locations the examples of therapeutic agents are given. Contrary to applicant's arguments, these locations do not clearly point out or literature references as to how millions of compounds, which the generic formula encompasses, can be prepared and whether they retain the drug efficacy at all. As previously pointed out, the only working example provided is the attachment of specific steroid with phosphocholine by direct linkage and not through linkers and X moiety.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chasalow (5,830, 432)

Chasalow discloses compounds wherein a drug derivatives of phosphocholine and methods of increasing the aqueous solubility of bioactive agent by conjugating them to phosphocholine moieties. According to Chasalow, any active agent could be used and those include steroids and aspirin (note the abstract, col. 2, line 25 through col. 4, line 65; examples and claims). . Example 5 in particular shows the attachment of DHEA (steroid) through alcohol linkage to homocholine.

What are lacking in Chasalow are the examples, wherein of the attachment of instant drugs to the phosphate group of phosphocholine through a linker moiety which is an alky group. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare compounds with an alkyl (CH2 groups) as the linkers with a reasonable expectation of success since these are homologs and homologs are expected to behave the same way. In view of reference's suggestion that the method is applicable to any active agent and from the guidance provided by the reference, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any active agent with a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues that Chasalow is directed to increasing the bioavailability and/or aqueous solubility of pharmaceutically active agents, specifically via a free carboxy group to a phospholipid and not via an alcohol functionality. This argument is not found to be persuasive since as pointed out above, Chasalow teaches DHEA which

has an alcohol functionality besides his teachings of linkage through carboxylic moieties. Therefore, applicant's arguments are not found to be persuasive.

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D whose telephone number is (571) 272-0598. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM- 4 PM, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1615

GSK